

APPLICANT(S): Zvi Reznik et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/574,023
FILED: 01/17/2007
Page 13

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 12 to 63 were pending in the application. Claims 12 to 63 have been rejected. Claim 57 was objected to. Claims 12, 26, 42 and 50 have been voluntarily amended for clarification purposes. Claims 55 to 63 have been canceled.

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims add no new matter and are fully supported by the disclosure of the application as filed.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 57. The claim has been canceled and the objection is accordingly moot.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 26, 28-29, 33-34, 36, 37, and 39-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Schreiber (Proceedings of the IEEE, vol 83, No 6).

Claims 12-22, 24-25, 27, 31-32, 35 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schreiber in view of Seroussi (US . 5,764,374).

APPLICANT(S): Zvi Reznik et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/574,023
FILED: 01/17/2007
Page 14

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schreiber in view of Seroussi, further in view of Shattil (US 2004/ 0,141, 548).

Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Schreiber in view of Shattil.

Claim 41 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Schreiber.

Claims 42 to 44, 46 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Schreiber in view of Taubman (US 6, 778, 709).

Claims 45 and 47-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Schreiber in view of Taubman further in view of Seroussi.

Claims 50-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Schreiber in view of Van (US2003/0, 179, 938).

Applicants respectfully traverse all the 102 and 103 rejections entirely or partially based on Schreiber in view of the fact that Schreiber suggests video transmission techniques based on the MPEG standard. The Examiner appears to have analogized MPEG delta frames and the data contained therein with the image data “refinement portion” recited in the present application’s claims as filed. However, contrary to the limitation found in each of the independent claims 12, 26, 42 and 50 that the refinement portion(s) are based on a difference between an image and its own coarse value representation, the delta information of the MPEG standard is based on a comparison of an image frame to be transmitted and either: (1) a prior, or (2) a future image frame of the video. Accordingly, Schreiber does not teach or suggest the limitation relied upon as a basis for either the 102 or 103 rejections listed above.

In the interest of constructively furthering the prosecution of the present application, however, Applicant has voluntarily amended independent claims 12, 26, 42 and 50 to further highlight distinctions of the claimed invention from any known prior art – namely, that: spatial proximity between two symbols, each of which two symbols is associated with a different respective refinement value, is related to a numeric proximity between the respective refinement values. This limitation is supported by the teachings of the specification as filed including paragraph [0075].

APPLICANT(S): Zvi Reznik et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/574,023
FILED: 01/17/2007
Page 15

In view of the foregoing remarks and voluntary amendments, all the pending claims are considered to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

/VKS/

Vladimir Sherman
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 43,116

Dated: December 31, 2010

Eitan Mehulal Law Group
10 Abba Eban Blvd., P.O.B. 2081
Herzlia 46120, Israel
General Phone: (703) 486-1150
Facsimile: (703) 892-4510